



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1995

No. 58

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, March 27, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God almighty. Heaven and Earth are filled with Your glory. Praise and honor be to You, Lord most high. Lord of all creation, re-create our hearts to love You above all. Ruler of the universe, reign over us. Lord of our Nation, we invite You to live in us as our personal Lord. Sovereign of history, guide the vital page in history that will be written today. As we begin this new day, we declare our dependence and interdependence. We confess with humility that we are totally dependent on You, dear God. We could not breathe a breath, think a thought, or exercise dynamic leadership without Your constant and consistent blessing. We praise You for the gifts of intellect, education, and experience. All You have done in us has been in preparation for what You want to do through us now. We are here by Your divine appointment.

And we know we could not achieve the excellence You desire without the tireless efforts of others. We thank You for our families and friends, the faithful and loyal staffs that make it possible for the Senators to function so effectively, and for all who make the work of this Senate run smoothly. Help us express our gratitude by singing our appreciation for the unsung heroes and heroines who do ordinary tasks with extraordinary diligence. We praise You for the gift of life and those who make work a joy. In the name of Him who taught us the greatness of being servant leaders. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The distinguished Senator from Colorado is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, this morning the leader time has been reserved, and there will be a period for morning business until the hour of 10:45 a.m., with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the exception of the following: Senator CAMPBELL, 10 minutes, and Senators NICKLES and REID, 10 minutes combined. At the hour of 10:45 a.m. today, the Senate will proceed to a 15-minute rollcall vote on passage of S. 219, the regulatory moratorium bill. Immediately following the vote on passage of S. 219, the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 1158, the supplemental disaster assistance bill. Therefore all Senators should be aware that votes can be expected throughout today's session.

MORNING BUSINESS

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 644 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use my leadership time this morning to talk about a couple of issues, if I may.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wish to commend, first of all, Senator NICKLES and Senator REID for their leadership over the last couple of days. The legislation that the Senate will be voting on a little later on is legislation that I believe enjoys broad bipartisan support. It does so because it is moderate, because it addresses a serious problem, and because it gives us a tool with which to work more effectively through the regulatory morass that has existed now for a long period of time.

I think it is equally clear that the moratorium is dead. We have driven a wooden stake through the heart of the moratorium. It is dead and I say good riddance.

This legislation, were it to come up again out of conference, would suffer the same consequences. I want everyone to understand the great disappointment that would be felt on our side were the moratorium to come back at some later date or in some other form. We have negotiated and worked in good faith, and I think we, as a result of that good-faith work over the last couple of days, have come up with an alternative to the moratorium, something that we expect to be an effective tool, something that we strongly support on this side of the aisle.

We have laid out the adverse consequences of a moratorium. I believe that both Republicans and Democrats want to ensure that we do not jeopardize meat safety, that we do not jeopardize children with dangerous toys, that we do not jeopardize women with the loss of good mammography, that we do not jeopardize people with the problems that a moratorium would

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 4749

have created in our efforts to achieve clean air and clean water.

So we recognize that a moratorium is an extreme measure that, frankly, does not work. It is an extreme measure that may have been part of a 100-day plan in the House. Nevertheless, I do not care whether we take 1,000 days in the State, it is not something that we can support here.

Let me also commend Senators GLENN and LEVIN for their work over the last couple of days. They have improved the original version of the regulatory veto in a very significant way. I think their efforts have given even greater life and support to the concept that Senators REID and NICKLES have presented to the Senate in the regulatory veto.

Let me just say in closing, Mr. President, that this is an example of the moderating influence of the Senate. We have seen extreme measures acted upon in the House over the last couple of months. Those extreme measures are not ones that we feel very comfortable with on this side of Capitol Hill. Indeed, we had similar reactions to the House proposals on unfunded mandates, congressional coverage, and line-item veto, and a number of very important pieces of legislation.

Because of the moderating influence of the Senate, because of the ability of Democrats and Republicans to work together more effectively, we have been able to take the extreme proposals and put them away, hopefully for good, and pass legislation that many of us are very pleased to support.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this year we are going to be involved in a very significant debate about the Conservation Reserve Program. From time to time, I want to address the Senate on various agricultural-related issues. Perhaps one of the most important of all is the Conservation Reserve Program. It has touched nearly every facet of life in rural States, including that of the distinguished Presiding Officer. It has reduced soil erosion, it has substantially increased wildlife habitat, it has improved water quality, and it has reduced crop surpluses.

As I look back at the many programs that Congress has contemplated, considered, and ultimately enacted in the last 10 years, I think one would be hard pressed to find a program that has worked better than the CRP. No program has more effectively invested Federal dollars in natural resources than has the CRP. As a consequence of the program's tremendous success, it enjoys broad support from agricultural groups, conservation groups, environmental groups, and virtually everybody else in rural America.

Mr. President, 2.1 million of the 36.4 million acres enrolled in the CRP are located in my State. In South Dakota, the erosion rate on CRP land fell from

12 tons an acre to just over 1 ton an acre over the last 10 years—a dramatic reduction in destructive and wasteful erosion. All told, the CRP has generated a reduction of soil erosion in my State alone of over 22 million tons.

Nationwide, soil erosion has decreased by 19 tons per acre. So the program has had an even greater effect in other States than it has had in South Dakota.

Chart 1 shows where the bulk of the success has been. The red depicts those areas where we have seen significant soil erosion reduction—the Mountain States, the southern plains, and the northern plains, which includes, of course, South Dakota. We have seen about 126 million tons of soil erosion reduction in the Mountain States; 145 million tons of soil erosion reduction in our area of the country; and in the southern plains, we have seen the greatest success story of all, 170 million tons in soil erosion reduction.

So in every part of the country, we have seen a substantial degree of progress in reduction of soil erosion. But if you look more carefully at the chart you will see that where the greatest potential lies for soil erosion, where we saw the greatest consequences of soil erosion in the past, we have now seen the greatest progress. That really, in one picture alone, depicts what I consider to be the success story of CRP over the last 10 years.

Simply looking at the topsoil savings really does not tell the whole story, however. Costs to society of impaired water quality from farmland erosion are \$208 billion a year. We are substantially preserving and improving water quality through the CRP because it idles so much highly erodible land.

The CRP has also had a significant positive effect on several species that were endangered. The prairie chicken and the sharp-tailed grouse were threatened and endangered species. Those have come back to flourish as a result of the efforts in CRP.

More than 85 percent of the CRP acres have now been planted to grasses. The CRP also has fostered tree plantings on 3,600 square miles. That, Mr. President, is the equivalent of Yosemite and Glacier National Parks combined. In a sense, with the CRP, we have actually created the equivalent of two new national parks, if you just consider the effect in tree plantings alone. So the program has created a substantial new incentive to plant trees and, obviously, when trees are planted, it is far less likely that the enrolled land will come back into production in the future.

In my State, of course, pheasants are very prominent, and we are very proud of the fact that we are probably the pheasant capital of the world. We have attracted 128,000 hunters in 1993 who spent more than \$50 million in our rural communities. More than \$13 billion in resource-based benefits to soci-

ety have been generated by the CRP over the life of the program.

So I guess the short summary is, Mr. President, if you look at endangered species, if you look at the tree plantings, if you look at the consequences for recreation and tourism—and in my State, something I love personally to do, the opportunities for more pheasant, goose, and duck hunting—CRP has vastly expanded the opportunities to do the kinds of things that we go out West to do each and every year.

CRP has also had significant consequences with regard to reductions in Federal spending. We have saved the Federal Treasury \$16 million in subsidy payments just in 1 year alone by removing the marginal lands from production. We save money in large measure because the CRP gives farmers an opportunity to do something other than plant for the program on their highly erodible acres. It is no longer necessary for producers to plant their erodible land just to get deficiency payments, to get disaster payments, or to get whatever other payments the Federal Government may have. Now, CRP gives them an ecologically and economically sound alternative.

In South Dakota, nearly 1.5 million cropland base acres were enrolled into the CRP. If commodities had been planted on this land, taxpayers would have paid crop subsidy payments on these acres, and the figure would have been millions of dollars more than what it is right now.

Chart 2 depicts really the anticipated result of what would happen if we lost the CRP in the future. The post contract CRP land uses have been the subject of a good deal of discussion. What we see here is that all of the green would be what we anticipate going back into production. There would be plant to crop, 43 percent; cash rent to other farmers, 13 percent; annual set-asides, 4 percent; and, of course, some would go into the 0/92 program.

In essence, you have a good percentage of current CRP acreage that would go back into the same kind of production activity that we experienced in the mid-1980's, that massive production was one of the primary causes of the cataclysmic economic situation that rural America experienced in the mid-1980's.

The contracts begin to expire this year, and over half of the CRP contracts will expire by 1997. All will expire by the year 2001. Only 63 percent of contract holders now plan to return the CRP acres. That is this green that I have mentioned. Only 9 percent would voluntarily keep their land in wildlife habitat or trees. That is something we hope to expand dramatically. Obviously, 9 percent is a good start, but we have to go a lot further than 9 percent if, indeed, the CRP will have the lasting benefits that we all hope it will have.

The third chart depicts, Mr. President, the effect of the CRP on the actual farm program itself.